

The Republican.

No. 3. Vol. 7.] LONDON, Friday, Jan. 17, 1823. [PRICE 6d.

ON REVOLUTION.

AN

ESSAY IN THREE PARTS.

PART I. On the Political Signification of the word Revolution.

II. On the best Means of effecting a Revolution.

III. On the Objects to be obtained by a Revolution, with a few Hints on the Means of obtaining and preserving them.

“When society was first regulated, the laws could not be adjusted so as to take in the future conduct of its members, because the faculties of man are unfolded and perfected by the improvements made by society; consequently the regulations established as circumstances required were very imperfect. What then is to hinder man at each epoch of civilization from making a stand and new modelling the materials that have been hastily thrown into a rude mass which time alone has consolidated and rendered venerable.”

M. WOLLSTONECRAFT, on the French Revolution.

PART I.

On the Political Signification of the word Revolution.

Too many people are alarmed at the word Revolution.—Changes of every description, it must be confessed, have their inconveniences, even such changes as we make upon our own judgment without opposition, and with every human probability as to effect. A change which is to be wrought by an immense multitude of different habits and sentiments, must of necessity be so fraught with danger and uncertainty that, for opinion's sake only, it is never undertaken. A change in a form of Government will never, in our time at least, be a question of science but one of prudence; the decision will always depend on the balance which shall appear on fairly weighing existing evils against the chance of others which may attend the transit to contemplated advantage. When the balance which every man will strike from his own

Printed and Published by R. Carlile, 5, Water Lane, Fleet Street, & 201, Strand.

estimation, and which will therefore vary in every instance, shall yet be so clearly in favour of the change, as to be obvious in a greater or less degree, to the great majority; then is the period for a Revolution. At such a period no horrors are to be expected, for where interest leads, men follow in quick and silent acquiescence. A little skill, a little patience, a little forbearance, a little yielding, plain dealing, and an ordinary exercise of the social virtues, are all that are required to ward off every calamity which timid minds anticipate for such occasions. Let us suppose, for example, that all (excepting of course those whose existence, or rather whose mode of existence, is the grand evil to be removed) are convinced upon patient and mature deliberation, that the ills which they bear are so many and so heavy, that the good which they anticipate is so great and so unequivocal, and that the chance of danger from miscarriage is so small, that upon a fair audit the trial may be made consistently with prudence; let us suppose such a case, and what is there to apprehend from a Revolution? And yet there are persons who cannot contemplate a Revolution under any circumstances without apprehension; they do not fully understand the political signification of the word. In order to have a clear idea of the word Revolution we must first come to a complete understanding of the word Government.

No mistake or confusion of terms is more prevalent than the indiscriminate use of the words *rights* and *privileges*. Rights are natural, and from God. Privileges artificial and of human institution. Governments are of two kinds, the unauthorised, or that power to which men submit against their wills; and the authorised, or that which is of society's own creation, subsists by its will, and is found necessary to the maintenance of order. The first stands on no right whatever, and is abolished whenever sufficient strength for the purpose can be raised—the other stands on this basis, that men have by nature equal rights, but unequal powers. Government on this basis is a combination of the powers of individuals, and a delegation thereof to certain persons appointed in trust to preserve to each individual the free exercise of his rights. It has been said (by Burke, I believe, among other sophists and mystifiers) that in society a man surrenders his natural rights; but this is erroneous. He surrenders only his natural powers, and that for the purpose of forming, together with the other members of his community, a common stock sufficient to preserve to him the free exercise of his natural rights. If all men were equally

powerful or equally virtuous there could be no such thing as a Government; for there would be nothing on earth to be governed. We must never lose sight of that maxim laid down by Paine, that society is the consequence of our mutual wants, and Government of our vices. Government thus established is nothing more than the management of the common and public business of the people who support it, and it is therefore the property of the existing generation. Besides the purpose of a Government, which, as I have said before, is the preservation of the free exercise of his natural rights to every individual in society, we ought to keep in mind the means of its existence. Government is the use of the combined power of a certain people; its date must therefore be coeval with that of the same people. There can be no such thing as an old Government; for there is no power in dead bodies. The system on which the Government acts may be old, but the Government itself can be in no sense older than the oldest man who contributes to its support; but it is not even so, for it must always be as young as the youngest. The means of governing consist of the contributions of the people for whom the Government acts. The same people are at once governor and governed; but here is the distinction, they govern collectively, they are governed individually. Without the strength both physical and intellectual of the present generation, there can be no Government; and as in every partnership, the going out of one member and the introduction of another are events which dissolve the original firm and substitute a new one, so in every community as old members are dying and new ones coming to maturity every day, the civil Government may be said to rise *de novo* with every sun. The compact must be virtually renewed every day or the Government would become unauthorised and oppressive. Still it must be obvious to every person who deliberates on this subject that no system of Government has been, or is likely to be, devised under which oppression and injustice shall not find shelter. Not one of those fairy fabrics which political writers have indulged their fancies in erecting, but may be most fairly objected to even by the most anxious lover of liberty and mankind. Yet let not any captious slave endeavour from this acknowledged truth to draw an argument in support of established oppression. Let it not be lost sight of that Government itself is an evil; a necessary one it is true, but nevertheless an evil, and a great one; an error of magnitude, but the legitimate consequence of other errors to which so-

ciety is a victim. Perfection is not therefore proper to any species of Government, inasmuch as Government is itself one of our grossest imperfections. What remains then for the politician but to keep the extent of this evil so exactly commensurate with the demands of society as that the progress of the latter may never be impeded by the operations of the former.

It can admit of no doubt, that Civil Government, while it is a necessary restraint on some, is perfectly inoperative towards a very large portion of every community. Let a man ask himself, Should I rob? Should I commit murder, perjury, adultery? In short, should I wilfully injure any of my neighbours? Should I not live in all respects precisely as I do at present if no Government existed? The responses which thousands will give to this catechism will convince them, that were it possible to form a society of such persons as themselves exclusively, the making of laws among them, still more the paying of persons to execute those laws, would be unnecessary and absurd. It follows, then, or ought to follow, that however remote the period may be, a period will arrive when mankind will be released from that enormous evil—Government. Keeping this stedfastly in view, it is only to be inquired what the state of society really requires, for that which is only a necessary restraint at one time, becomes an unnecessary, an improper, and a dangerous delegation of power at another. Let others amuse themselves as they will with the terms Monarchy, Republic, Aristocracy, Democracy, &c., let the titles of the appointees and delegates be what they may, the consideration is simply, *What is the nature of the power which society must delegate to its officers, to suit the existing state of that society, and in what portions shall that power be delegated so as to prevent as much as possible its being abused?* And this is a consideration which may be, and ought to be made daily by every society which desires to make a great and rapid progress to the summit of human grandeur and happiness. Having shewn what Government really is, I have thus also shewn that Revolution, properly understood, is that change in the nature of the Government which the progress of humanity requires. No other Government has a right to exist than such as may, by the express condition of its existence, be altered at the will of the community. This alteration, when in great and fundamental particulars, is called Revolution; and thus it appears that Revolutions of Government are essential to the progress of human happiness, and the

proper duty of every age. On the other hand, there is to be met occasionally an unaccountable notion of the sanctity of power, which would oblige us to abstain from all inquiry into the nature and authority of its existence, and yield whatever is asked without considering for what purpose it is wanted, or whether that purpose ought to be obtained. Foremost in preaching this strange doctrine is one Dr. Chalmers, who at Glasgow, in the year of our Lord 1820, preached and published a sermon for the purpose of maintaining the truth and propriety of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, wherein he says, that the powers which be are ordained of God, and that whosoever resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God, and that they who resist shall receive to themselves damnation. I am no Churchman, nor am I skilled in theologicals, but I will endeavour to shew the folly and the falsehood of this sentence as well as of the Doctor's application of it to the purpose of deterring men from making improvements in their forms of Government, and leave it to Dr. Chalmers to reconcile this falsehood and folly with the character of an Apostle, ancient or modern. If by the "powers that be" St. Paul meant to confine himself to the powers which then existed in Rome, if he merely meant to say that the Emperor Nero was ordained of God, then, indeed, (though we may turn up our eyes in astonishment) we have nothing at all to do with the matter in the way of argument: but if he meant to say that all power is ordained of God, it is true only in that universal sense in which is comprised the power of the usurper, the murderer, the thief, the ravisher, in short, the successful brute of every species. Nothing is easier than to expose the hollowness of this childish dealing with the Deity. If the powers that be are ordained of God, the same must be said of the powers that are to be, when their turn shall have arrived. Are not all things ordained of God, good as well as evil? Passion is ordained of God; but so is Reason, that holds Passion in check: lean and pallid Want is ordained of God; and so is smile-dispensing Charity, which comes to relieve it: Cruelty is ordained of God; and so also is Mercy, which stops its hand. Except in this sweeping and general sense, to which no argument against resistance can possibly be fastened, the saying is a falsehood, and St. Paul's own conduct is a proof that he felt it to be so, for he was practically, if not professedly, at constant variance with the powers of his day. He was turned out of Antioch; narrowly escaped punishment at Iconium; was stoned and left for dead at Lystra; was

imprisoned and set in the stocks at Phillippi; was obliged to fly off by night from Jason's house at Thessalonica, and not suffered to rest at Berea; and was seized, put in irons, and nearly scourged at Jerusalem, whence he was dispatched to Cesarea, and kept for two years in prison by Felix and Festus. Nay, like any poor Scotch Radical of the present day, he was actually accused of sedition by a hacknied orator, one Tertullus. "For we have found this man a pestilent fellow, and a mover of sedition amongst all the Jews throughout the world, and a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes." Acts, chap. xxiv. ver. 5. Now, to what extent the Doctor would have us succumb to this doctrine I know not, but I must beg leave to remind him and his congregation, if any of them stand in need of being reminded, that in 1812 and 1813, the Imperial throne of France was an existing power, and a power far greater than any of its contemporaries. Was that power likewise ordained of God? Was it to receive to ourselves damnation to resist that? Then why did not Dr. Chalmers spout his political sermon at the allied powers when they were instigating the people by false protestations and false promises to the work of overthrowing the French Emperor? It is lucky for Dr. Chalmers, if he be a conscientious Presbyterian, that he was not born at the same time with John Calvin and Martin Luther, for if he had been, he must, upon his own argument, have denounced all attempts at establishing a Church upon his own favourite model. The Pope was then one of the "powers that were." To have resisted his authority would have been, according to the Doctor upon St. Paul, to have received to himself damnation: yet Calvin resisted and succeeded, and now see the honour and liberality of this learned Doctor! He himself is a good Presbyterian; he avows himself and preaches his opinions; he avails himself of the courage of his predecessors who opposed the Pope and reformed the Church, and, at the same time, most argumentatively hands over these courageous Reformers to damnation for having resisted one of the "powers which were." This is true cowardice; the doctrine is tantamount to the cry of "Long life to the Conqueror;" it shuns change only because in changing there is peril—but it falls in with all settled things. According to this, Charles the First was ordained of God; then Cromwell was ordained of God; then Cromwell's son; then Charles the Second; then his brother, James the Papist; and then Protestant William, who stepped into the vacant throne: all were ordained of

God. And even the Pretender, had he succeeded, (which no thanks to the Scotchmen he did not) would have come in for his share of God's ordinance. It is only bearing with the denunciation of Dr. Chalmers for awhile, and running the risk of damnation by failure, or death in the interim, and every new power, if it should live and thrive, is sure of obtaining in due time the full sanctity of God's ordinance and the adulation of Dr. Chalmers. This is a Doctor's way of doing honour to God. According to this, Macbeth was Heaven's anointed, and Ali Pacha of God's holy ordinance. But enough of Dr. Chalmers.

We who are not gownsmen know, that the powers which be, though of God in a universal sense, are in the common acceptation of the words of human institution; that Government is a necessary evil with which society is burthened; and that all our pains should be exerted to render it as light as possible, until mankind shall have altogether outgrown the necessity of restraint. We know that as we become better acquainted with our natures, and more capable of estimating with precision the force of our passions, we find reason to make alterations in those laws which we had imposed for the preservation of freedom and tranquillity. Revolution is the making of these alterations; a necessary, a virtuous, a god-like undertaking. Like every advance in science, the first steps are rude and unsteady, but firmness and grace are acquired by degrees as we approach perfection. The worst is already passed; the present state of intellectual ascendancy gives assurance of a safe and quiet progress in future. It must be recollected, that power is the first object of that self-love from which all our passions spring, and which, corrected by knowledge, has an invariable tendency, for its own sake, to end in the most unbounded love and confidence for and in our fellow-creatures. From the times when out of every hundred men ninety-nine were the slaves of one, as we now find men in barbarous countries, to this, in which thousands are living together in a state of social equality, what vast changes have taken place. Yet who shall say that perfection is obtained in politics more than in any other science? And if it has not been obtained, why are such alterations as seem necessary to the welfare and happiness of society, to be shunned with horror? The very vice of individual man, that lust of power, that disposition to tyrannize which makes the institution of a Government so essential to society, has a natural tendency to corrupt the Government whose purpose is to keep tyranny in

check : and this tendency Revolution must counteract. For why, if men are to suffer under oppression, should they keep one to suffer under ? If a Government does not effectually preserve to them their natural freedom, they would do better by living in anarchy, to which no trouble or expence is attached : thus, while it is the object of society to advance itself, Government, unless narrowly watched, and by repeated alterations kept in its proper relative station towards society, has a strong tendency to retard the progress of the latter, and become an unqualified and intolerable evil. Virtue is so essential to the existence of man, that although individuals have not yet sufficient confidence in each other to depend upon their practice of it for the safety of themselves and the State, it is, nevertheless, universally agreed on that it shall be observed, and Government is an expedient for forcing virtue on society. Every step which we take in the science of morality, every discovery respecting the nature, strength, and predominancy of our several passions, calls for a revision of the Government, and renders it necessary to make an alteration therein, if it appear that the powers which have been constituted for the purposes of Government are either inadequate, superfluous, or dangerous. It is also necessary, for prudence sake, to keep watch over the officers appointed to execute these powers, for it will happen, that in the persons of some men offices will become of a very different character from that with which they were originally endowed. Great powers may without apprehension be suffered to lie in the hands of one man which it would be exceedingly imprudent to trust to another. A succession of two or three lives may be necessary to develop a latent impropriety in the distribution of the public power. Revolution is the taking advantage of every such developement. Experience will also teach new modes of executing the laws and transacting the business of society, which with respect to economy, order, and dispatch, have a superiority over existing forms. Revolution is the State's availing itself of this knowledge. Revolution is often expedient, and will be sometimes indispensably necessary, but never, properly speaking, unlawful. If any law should exist, the purpose of which was to prevent a people from altering their Government, that is, if a people were to bind themselves to punish themselves if ever they should grow wiser and attempt to derive some benefit from their wisdom, must not such a law become utterly powerless when the people had risen up to disobey it ? Could the constituted authorities strike when deprived by

the sovereign people of the instruments of power? Could they exist after that the breath of their life had been recalled by their Creator? Could a people, accountable to no person or body but themselves, bind themselves at one time not to act as they should think fit or feel disposed at a future time? If they could be mad enough to conceive so much folly, could they practise it? Would not the same wilfulness which induced them to make the law induce them to break it? Certainly it would. Away, then, with all apprehensions and scruples on the subject. Let Doctors and Lawyers preach as they will, the truth is simply this, that no Government possesses power which it does not derive from the people; and that the people have a right to depute and resume that power as they think proper. This I have maintained and will maintain in opposition, if it must be so, to all the schools and universities between Johnny Groat's and St. Michael's Mount, until some of my antagonists shall "shew us the hand of God" that hath set up any particular person or family to rule and govern the world, without, or in contempt of, the will of the people;—

"For well we know no hand of blood and bone
Can gripe the sacred handle of *our* sceptre."

PART II.

On the best Means of effecting a Revolution.

NOTHING can prove more clearly the subjection, which the created power of a Government lies under to the influence of individual passions, than the severe laws which in all States have been made to repress attempts at altering the nature and form of the Government, and to punish the authors of such attempts. On the first consideration it appears unfortunate that there should not be in every constitution an express plan laid down by which the people should at will resume their supreme power of constituting a Government, but as the right and the power always exist, and several generations may pass away, before it become necessary to revert to the exercise of those original powers; it is on the whole better perhaps that the plan should in all cases of Revolution be made to suit the present exigency. Having in recollection the nature of the only Government to which we owe any obedience, it will readily occur that as the people have at all times the right and the power to alter that Government, it is perfectly

compatible with the tranquillity and advantage of every community, as well as the freedom of every individual, for any member of the community to endeavour to persuade the whole, or the majority, that an alteration or Revolution may be advantageously undertaken. The propriety of this is necessarily consequent upon the right of the community to alter their Government, for how else is the alteration to be begun and carried on than by the suggestion of a few, and a free discussion?

That which it is right to do it must be right to propose. If by a law any society should have made it dangerous for an individual to make such a proposition, it is a law which wants the sanction of natural right, and ought not therefore to be respected. For as society is composed of individuals, and is no more numerous for being connected and organized than was the rude multitude from which it sprang, so are its rights composed only of the rights of individuals, and no more in number than were those which belonged to each separate member before society existed. The opinion of every man in a community ought to be heard, and for this plain reason, that, with regard to forms, the opinion of the majority constitutes the law, and that that opinion can only be ascertained and made manifest by a perfect freedom of expression. If therefore I say danger exists in giving any opinion whatever on public affairs, or offering argument to persuade a whole community to alter their system of Government, if I say danger has (improperly it must be) been thrown in the way of either of these, it is a danger which a lover of liberty ought to be proud to meet. "It is dangerous to take cold, to sleep, to drink; but out of this nettle, danger, we pluck this flower safety." For my own part I know the common cry and I despise it. Every man has a real personal and deep interest in politics. He has not merely an undoubted right to take his due share in the concerns of the community in which he lives; but he has a strong interest in so doing, and nothing but a most unworthy fear can prevent him from attending to his interest in this particular. He thinks the risk of danger more than equal to his certain losses under a bad Government, and he disguises his cowardice under the mask of indifference; but ask any man if he would not rather keep his money for his own use than pay it away in taxes to be squandered on worthless projects, and still more worthless men, and even employed in keeping him in a state of awe and subjection. Will he not answer in the affirmative? Then why should he not

stretch out a hand to assist in obtaining the object of his choice? Perhaps he has been taught that the virtues of humanity may be exercised with most advantage in the small circle of his family and relations, and that an attention to more general matters would only lead him into fruitless difficulties, and even deprive him of the means of living like a worthy man within the sphere of his immediate connection. But this is a most pernicious doctrine. How can that be folly or vice in the abstract which is wisdom and virtue in the particular? To the notice of such persons I recommend the following passage from one of the Essays of Hume, who often appears to have been a better friend to civil liberty than the corrupt Whigs will allow him, and who has pointed out the consequences of our funding system with a precision that ought to make every English stockholder stand aghast. "A man who loves only himself without regard to friendship or merit is a detestable monster: and a man who is only susceptible of friendship, without public spirit or a regard to the community, is deficient in the most material part of virtue."

Thus then it appears that the expediency of a Revolution is at all times a legitimate subject of discussion, in which one of the most material points is the precise course which should be adopted for effecting that proposed. I have said in my first essay, that, in the present state of society, Revolution will be a matter of necessity and not of choice. Should a Government become so embarrassed (which is a proof of either great roguery or great imbecility) or abuse its trust so scandalously as to be an intolerable and unqualified evil, and the people be therefore obliged to resume their authority and remodel the system of Government—the first step is a matter of some consideration and some difficulty. In the first place there will perhaps be in existence a law to punish them as individuals for such a proceeding. But this is a small obstacle. Whatever laws there may be of this description they perish at the first movement of the people. For when a people, or the major part of a people, whose agent the legislature is, by one consent act in defiance of a law, that law is henceforth virtually and substantially repealed.

The difficulty is in practice only; that is in collecting the sense of the people with accuracy and such expedition as the case requires. This difficulty will however be much less in communities which are subdivided into small, distinct homogeneous masses, than in such as are huge and promiscuous. In communities of the former kind, meetings may be pro-

posed by any member to others of the same class, and requisitions forwarded to the officers empowered to call the meetings. In passing its resolutions on the subject in debate each class acts independently of the rest, and as if it formed the whole community; and when passed, hands those resolutions over to a committee appointed for that purpose, with powers to communicate with other committees, and consider and report the nature of the alterations necessary to be made in the form of Government, and of the best mode of effecting them.

The meetings would of course be not dissolved but adjourned to a given time, and at the next meeting the classes might receive the reports of their several committees, and having ordered the reports to be printed, that the members of each class might peruse them at leisure and deliberate on the subject, adjourn for another short period. At the third meeting the reports might be taken into consideration, when the several committees, or any individual member of any of the classes, might propose a set of resolutions founded on the reports, which resolutions, or amendments thereof, might be put and carried.

This done, a second interview between the several committees, or delegates from the committees, should be held for the purpose of ascertaining the points of distinction, if any, between the resolutions of one class and those of another. A free discussion would in a short time reconcile all differences; but, if it should happen that some classes could not be brought to agree with the others, the sense of the majority could easily be ascertained by means of delegates, when, by frequent meetings and repeated discussions, the matter in dispute had been brought out into a clear and intelligible shape.

These are a few hasty suggestions of what might be done by a community subdivided into small bodies, when circumstances had rendered it necessary for them to remodel their Government.

Revolutions in minor parts of the system are effected every year by the constituted authorities themselves, which acts of Revolution derive their sanction from the tacit acquiescence of the people. They are of themselves unauthorised acts; for all civil power is delegated power, and the inferior cannot have a right to controul the superior. The supposition is absurd. There are indeed persons who affecting even an especial love of freedom, but understanding very little of its true nature, talk of the special compact between a king or

other officer and his people, and of the reciprocal duties of each.

But, before a compact can exist, there must be two independent parties; and who are the parties to this supposed compact? One of them, the people, we know, they are God's creatures and the tenants of this world. But what creature is a king or an emperor? Has he any being but in the good will of the people? How can such a person enter into a compact with a people? This style of talking of a king, as if he were an animal of a different species from man, is not much above the vulgar habit of speaking of Government, as if it were a real living creature, a rich old gentleman, for example, with unfathomable pockets. That the constituted authorities are the persons by whom alone a Revolution should be effected, is a position which is proved to be false by reference to the nature of Government. Civil Government, to look back at the definition contained in my first essay, is the exercise of delegated power; and the delegate, or creature, can no more be empowered to alter the nature or prolong the period of its existence, than Sampson could will away the strength of his arm, or Goliath the height of his stature. The people, the creators and appointers, have the power of executing their wills, and of this power they can by no means divest themselves, if at any time, and in perfect confidence in their delegates, they should forbear the exercise of their power. No doubt it would be the readiest way in such an emergency, as effecting a Revolution, to make use of known persons, and avoid the trouble of calling meetings and making appointments, if the people were sure that their wishes would be faithfully attended to, and their orders implicitly obeyed. But, unfortunately, history affords no examples to encourage a people in trusting to the honour and fidelity of public officers for their laying down power when it had become unnecessary that it should be retained, and for their detecting and departing from every encroachment upon the strict line of their appointments. And when the evil which calls for a reformation is felt by the people, and is pointed out to the parties concerned, with a request that they will remove it, and when these parties absolutely refused to do so, can it be contended that they have the right to decide on the propriety of their making such a reformation, and that the people are not to stir in the case of a refusal? To whom are the people to account if they proceed to divest their servants of the power

entrusted to their care, and re-model the Government in such a manner as I have before said might be adopted?

In my first essay I have defined Government to be the exercise of the combined power of a people. I am now supposing (a common case, it must be allowed) that the persons entrusted with this power have abused it, and that the people, finding that the purposes for which the Government was instituted, such as the liberty of their persons and the security of their property, are not answered, have resolved on a Revolution, that is, a change in the nature of the powers with which the Government is invested, and a more judicious distribution of those powers—what are the steps which in such a case it would be advisable for the people to take? There seem to be two chief acts to be done. The first, to decide in the most prompt and deliberate manner what powers shall form the future Government, and how they shall be administered; and second, to recall the public powers from the hands of the existing officers, and place in the hands of new ones, such only (and in such portions only) as should be thought necessary. For the first of these acts I have suggested, in rather a digressive manner (the detail being of necessity dependent on circumstances) what might be done in certain cases: with respect to the second, I shall do no more, it being quite sufficient, by way of illustration, to shew one practicable method. The first thing, then, might be, to refuse to pay taxes in whatever shape they existed; to turn excisemen out of doors; button up the pocket at the collector's knock; and postpone all acts on which the payment of any duties became due. This course might be sufficient during the progress of deliberation on the re-establishment of Government; when this had been concluded, the people, the first movers in working every machine of Government, might appoint persons to the principal offices of the State, who in the exercise of their newly-created authority would appoint subordinate agents. The work of taxation, always, even under the best of systems, begun with alacrity, would soon be entered upon, and the people, whose submission to their new Government would then be all that remained to give it effect, might pay the new imposts to the new officers, and thus pour the vital stream into the new creature of their own judgment and will, leaving the old one to die of atrophy, if it should not have gone off on the solemn proclamation of the people, that, from and after a certain day, the powers with which the late officers had been invested were recalled.

Heavens! if it may be permitted me, for one moment, to reflect on the reality of such a proceeding—should the sea of revenue ever recede from its wonted bed, what secrets would its depths disclose! What a world of monsters would be brought into the light of day! How many creatures who for generation upon generation have bred, fed, and fattened in the deep and impenetrable abyss, would be left gasping for breath upon the dry land!

But not to dwell on particulars, it is obvious that when a Revolution has become necessary, and the constituted authorities are opposed to the will of the people, and refuse to become the agents of their intention to re-model the Government, it remains only for the people to proceed to decreeing new forms and appointing new officers in the most quiet and expeditious manner possible. This can be done so as to be really and truly the act of the people, or, at least, the majority of the people, in no other way than by meetings in divisions, to which meetings every person is invited according to his situation. At such a time, those who absent themselves must be held to have surrendered up the exercise of their rights and judgments to their fellow-citizens, and the acts of those who are present must be accounted to be the solemn acts of the people. Whatever the precise course by which a new Government may be established, the general consent of the nation is necessary to sanctify its authority, and some such means as those which I have already suggested must be adopted in order to obtain that consent.

PART III.

On the Objects to be obtained by a Revolution, with a few Hints on the Means of obtaining and preserving them.

WHENEVER it shall have become necessary for a people to alter the nature and system of their Government, and to effect that alteration by their own direct means, the utmost latitude should be taken in availing themselves of all the knowledge and experience extant at the time. It would seem indeed by the pertinacity with which some persons adhere to whatever has the recommendation of antiquity, that nothing good is to be expected from time to come, and indeed that the world stands still, if it is not actually going backward. There are persons who would rake up the ashes of the dead, to throw them in the faces of the living. They

would send us back to the precepts of our forefathers, as if we were really young children; or as if the world did not follow the course of nature, but grew younger instead of older. They seem to think that not we, but the people who died a century ago, had the experience of that time to act upon. The true way of taking advantage of precedents, is to extract from them their principle, consider well, if this principle be a sound one; and if so, whether its operation have or have not been facilitated by modern practice. To apply these general remarks to the subject before me, Government, it is allowed, is a necessary evil, but endured on account of its efficacy in protecting us from others less tolerable. The principle therefore in all forms of Government, ancient as well as modern, is this protection; which, to define it briefly, is the preservation of the free exercise of our own right to follow our own inclinations in every respect, in which we do not encroach on the same freedom in our fellow creatures: if therefore any hardships, any violations of personal liberty, or any insecurity of property be felt under an established system, they afford not only proof conclusive of malpractices, but proof presumptive of the inadequacy of the system to its contemplated purposes. And when the question of revolution comes under discussion, the points to be considered are, firstly, if the public officers have abused and departed from the prescribed system, and by what means they have been enabled to do so: secondly, if the faults in which the evil has originated are proper to the system, or may be easily prevented for the future. Thirdly, if there exists in any other part of the world a society whose system of Government answers the purposes abovementioned more fully than the one under discussion; and what are the points of distinction between the two: and fourthly, if in the best system extant it be not possible to make some valuable improvements, from the facts and reasonings which have been elicited and laid down by able writers on these subjects.

These considerations which are of vital importance to every people, should be discussed with a steady regard to the true definition of an authorized Government. A people at such a juncture as above contemplated, should bear in mind that celebrated passage in Hooker, "By the natural law whereunto Almighty God hath made all subject, the lawful power of making laws to command whole politic societies of men, belongeth so properly unto the same entire societies, that for any prince or potentate of what kind

soever upon earth, to exercise the same of himself, and not either by express commission immediately and personally received from God, or else by authority derived at first from their consent, upon whose persons they impose the laws, it is no better than mere tyranny. *Laws they are not, therefore, which public approbation hath not made so.*" There is also a passage which I shall take the liberty of quoting from Lord Somers, wherein the same maxim is laid down. "Amongst all the rights and privileges appertaining to us, that of having a share in the legislature, and being to be governed by such laws as we ourselves shall chuse, is the most fundamental and essential, as well as the most advantageous and beneficial." From this and many other passages which might be selected from the best political writers, it is to be directly inferred that the object to be attained in every system of Government, is the expression of the people's will, and that that system is to be preferred, by which the will of the community may be ascertained with the greatest accuracy and facility, and carried into execution with the greatest promptness and effect.

Whatever difference of opinion may exist with regard to forms of Government, it is now too late for hearing any serious denial of the exclusive right of representation. Whether public officers have small powers or great ones, whether the distribution of public power be judicious, or imprudent, whether privileges be granted, or rights religiously kept; still each form of Government rests its claim on its proximity to pure representation. Giving the subject the best consideration which my mind is capable of, it appears to me, that if there does not exist in any known country a system of Government which in all respects elicits the will of the people who sustain it, and secures the operation of that will, yet, that the one which performs this with more certainty and effect than belong to any other, is the system of Government of the United States of America. That there are many things to be objected to, even in that Government, when we view it by the side of such a model as a philanthropist in his closet would conceive and construct still its imperfections, to launch a seeming paradox, are the very proof of its perfections; that is to say, it is to the will of the people, partaking of the defects incident to the present average state of human nature, and of which the Government is the organ, that the defects of the latter in a general and moral point of view are to be ascribed. It is not when a Government does not lead the people at a vast distance of

refinement and superior wisdom, but when it is at constant variance with the people, and pulls like an unbroken horse against the direction of its driver, that it can be accounted unauthorized, and in need of reformation.

There are some opinions much dwelt upon by those who not being interested in the perpetuation of tyranny and popular abasement and distress, are still opposed to changes in the form of Government; and especially to the practical adoption of a system, founded on the principles which I have laid down, and which as principles cannot I think be denied. For example it is contended that there is a real virtue suited to the actual state of society in that kind of Government, which is sustained by what is vulgarly called corruption, or in other words, by the influence acquired by a distribution of the public revenue. I am not going to contravert the position so boastingly maintained, that wealth will always have influence, and that while a people can be corrupted: a Government by corruption, is the only kind of Government proper for them: but when it is attempted to be inferred from the certain influence of wealth, that corruption must be eternal, the answer is this: let all undue means of acquiring wealth and particularly from the public purse be abolished, let wealth be as it then will be, a real representative of superior industry, skill, and ability, and its influence, so far from being corruption, will be the virtue best suited to the age. Wealth is never so fortuitously obtained, except it be from the public treasury, but it indicates some kind of merit. But the wealth which is obtained by robbery of the public and without any adequate services having been rendered for it, is a disgrace instead of an honour to its possessor, and can have no influence, which a friend to liberty and to mankind, ought not to wish to be destroyed. The public revenue is the grand source of oppression; and a strict watch over its expenditure the grand safe-guard of liberty. For a Government properly constructed, that is a Government truly representative, varies in minute points from time to time as the people become more and more enlightened; it floats up as it were, so as to be constantly on a level with the best and prevailing intellect of the age. But these changes however necessary and beneficial to the community at large, are not to the interest of the holders of public offices to which disproportionate salaries, flattering and unjust privileges, or great discretionary powers are affixed. It ought therefore to engage the closest attention of an intelligent people, that no such offices as these exist, and that immediately on its

appearing that obstacles to the people's will are set up by the public officers, a scrutiny into the nature and utility of their places be commenced.

I have ever considered that one of the greatest mistakes in the existing Governments is the high exaltation of public officers. The powers intrusted to the hands of any delegate should be just sufficient to answer the purposes of his office and no more; but when by privilege and emolument he is induced, and by powers he is enabled to continue in his office, after having set himself in opposition to the people's will; has not civil Government ceased, and the very evil of oppression and injustice, which civil Government is intended to prevent, become established?

The public offices, and indeed the whole form of Government which may with prudence and propriety be established, are such as afford the utmost facility and effect to real representation. It would be no difficult matter to specify, with the greatest precision, the number and occupations of the several officers necessary to carry on a representative Government, but it would be hazarding the charge of wild and visionary enthusiasm to enter on such a task by one's-self. For my own part I am far from dreading to encounter such a charge, but the task is not properly within the compass of my design here. Suffice it that I give a general and brief outline of the form which would most completely and effectually contain the spirit of representative Government.

There are but two divisions of the power of civil Government, namely the legislative and the executive.

In the first place then, the business of making laws and imposing taxes for the support of means to put the laws in practice should remain with the people themselves. This is fundamental and essential; and in order to combine this theory with convenient practice, the legislative body should be a parliament or assembly of men elected by the people themselves, every one having a vote; and the duration in office of each parliament should be a year, or a session if less than a year. This, besides being necessary as the most practicable method of admitting to the exercise of their natural rights, the incipient members of the community would occasion so close an intimacy and so perfect a uniformity of sentiment between representatives and constituents as that the will of the people would be really collected and enacted, and thus they would be truly "governed by such laws as they themselves had made," which is the "fundamental and

essential" principle (not feature) of freedom laid down and insisted on by Lord Somers.

The second great matter is the appointment of officers to carry the laws into execution ; but even here no discretion should be left with any one particular officer if it can be avoided, and the task of deciding on the guilt of any accused person should be also retained by the people themselves, for which purpose a better establishment than that of an English jury can scarcely be devised. The business of the appointed officers should be merely to declare the law applicable to each particular case, and to see it carried into execution. The appointment of officers should be for no purpose which can be readily and without inconvenience performed by the people themselves, and with no powers which may be abused ; and they should be entirely subject to the Parliament as the Parliament should be to the people. No officer should be paid more than a fair remuneration—time, diligence, and talents considered ; but, above all, no money should be thrown away in the vain and ridiculous attempt to invest any office with dignity. All public works, such, for instance, as bridges, canals, roads, harbours, and light-houses, should be under the especial management of the Parliament, by means of committees, who should report progress from time to time to the Parliament, and receive its directions. And, lastly, the intercourse with foreign nations should be carried on in the name of the people, and through their officer, with their immediate knowledge and concurrence as to every particular.

These are merely crude suggestions of what should be done to preserve and secure the liberty of a people. Such of the existing powers, offices, regulations, and forms, as are at variance with or in opposition to the grand purpose of Civil Government, will readily strike a candid and unprejudiced observer who tries their utility by the standard principles here laid down. I should not have passed so hastily and lightly over this part of the subject if it had been originally within my design, but as it was not, I offer these few remarks without apology. Enough has, I hope, been said to convince every reader, that the object to be kept in view in every Revolution is, such a deputation and apportionment of power as shall give the greatest certainty and effect to the will of the community, and form a real and efficient Representative Government.

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

MUCH RESPECTED CITIZEN,

It is the wish of the Republicans of Ashton-under-Line, like good Christians, again to visit you in Prison, in hopes that they may hear the consoling words, "I was in Prison, and ye came unto me," pronounced at the day of judgment, should that day ever arrive; and they feel confident they will stand as good a chance of "entering into the joy of their Lord" as the Christian Judge who sent you thither: but should it prove a mere chimera, they will still have the substantial pleasure of a self-approving conscience, and the respects of the liberal and humane among their fellow-mortals. This is, I think, more than the Bridge Street or Vice Society Hordes can reasonably expect.

They hail you with their approbation for your bold and upright conduct, and much admire your courage and constancy. To recompense you, in some measure, for the robberies you have suffered, and to assist in liquidating your and your Sister's fines, they send you herein enclosed the sum of Five Pounds Nine Shillings, being chiefly the donations of men and women who are not rigidly attached to any particular dogmas of religion, either belonging to Jew, Turk, or Christian—but of friends to free discussion and liberal sentiments, and these I generally find have the most liberal purse according to their abilities: from the Religionist you sometimes get his prayers, and frequently his curses, but never his pence; these the poor labouring dupes find hardly sufficient to supply the sleek faces and well-clothed backs of their itinerant Shepherds, who generally take good care of the surplus of the produce of their flocks.

An anecdote of one of these itinerant Shepherds among the Methodists, at calling upon one of his humble flock, was told to me the other day from undoubted authority. This Guardian of his flock was going round to stimulate them, as he called it, to the service of God, and accosting a poor worn-out labourer, who with his infirm and worn-out wife, were beholden in part to parochial relief for their subsistence, he said, "Well, Brother Bent, how does the Lord work with you now? Are you zealous in support of his cause?" Bent hoped he did his best. "Well, but" said the Priest, "do you keep up with your pennies?"—"Marry," said the poor rustic, "one can hardly get food enough fort keep one fro clemmink un let a loan ones pennies!" "Well," rejoined the Priest, seeing the poor man was getting a scanty beverage of tea, sweetened with a little coarse sugar, "you should endeavour to support the Lord's cause, and not neglect it by any means, for you should practise the greatest economy, and instead of using eightpenny sugar, you should use sevenpenny; thus you might shift to keep up with your subscriptions."—"Marry," rejoined the poor man, "but one has no money o to gether on wones like to ha sich us the har ut th' shop."

This is called being zealous in God's service by these sleek-faced, well-fed hypocrites! These are the followers of the humble Jesus, and they generally give you nothing but their anathemas; for, indeed, you have much injured their trade.

Give our kind respects to your Sister, and tell her we shall not forget an amiable female in Prison, whatever the "Lord's Commissioners" may do.

With an ardent wish that you may persevere manfully under your unjust persecutions, and that you and Mrs. Carlile may enjoy health and peace of mind, I remain yours, affectionately, on behalf of the Reformers of Ashton-under-Line.

CHARLES WALKER.

Ashton-under-Line, Dec. 23, 1822.

P. S. The Bridge Street Fever has, in a single instance, contaminated our atmosphere, and a prosecution hath been commenced against four individuals for commemorating the bloody deeds of the 16th of August, as I perceive you have been informed. Like the hidden snakes of Bridge Street, the supporters of the prosecution dare not avow themselves publicly; for at a full vestry-meeting of the parishioners, to hear and pass the Constable's accounts, who is the ostensible prosecutor, they would not allow the least expence to be paid by the parish, but scouted it with contempt. I had forgot to tell you, that a numerous party of your friends assembled on the 8th inst. to celebrate your natal day. The evening was spent in festivity, many songs were sung, and toasts drank, the principal of which was—"Richard Carlile, the Champion of Free Discussion, and may every Christian remain in Purgatory while he is in Prison."

	s.	d.		s.	d.
John Taylor	1	0	Alexander Thomson	0	3
Samuel Hibbert	1	0	John Eckersly	1	0
John Hibbert	2	6	John Jones, a Cambrian Bard	2	6
Robert Bottomly	2	6	Charles Walker one of Burke's		
William Hasledon, a real Deist	1	0	Incorrigibles	2	6
J. H. a Painite	1	0	Richard Smith	2	0
James Fletcher	1	0	James Boyle	2	9
Thomas Kenion	0	6	Joshua Hobson	2	0
James Crossly	1	0	James Higson	2	6
Ottewell	1	2	James Cheetham	2	6
John Buckley	1	0	William Warren, America	0	8
James Dronsfield	1	0	Abraham Matley	1	0
Cresswell Baraclough	1	0	Samuel Clayton	1	0
A Friend	0	6	William Hobson	1	0
James Buckley	1	0	Edward Hobson	1	0
Ernest Whitworth	0	6	Edward Hulme	2	6
Peter Whithead	1	0	Betty Cauley	1	0
Mr. Foster Ardwic	5	0	James Swale	0	6
Edward Mercer	1	0	Thomas Wood	2	0
Richard Thorp	0	6	William Mellor	2	6
John Booth	0	6	Benjamin Carr	0	6

	s.	d.		s.	d.
David Hibbert, an old veteran, whose name was in our last subscription omitted, we having entirely forgot him	0	3	<i>Subscription towards liquidating the Fines of Miss Mary Ann Carlile.</i>		
From Stagly Bridge, Joseph Hall	1	0	Thomas Fowler	1	0
Gervais Sawton	2	0	Sarah Alldrith	1	0
John Fletcher	2	0	John Newton	0	6
James Fielding	1	0	Edward Hall	1	0
Thomas Cook, best known by the name of (old Paine)	2	6	James Hadfield	0	3
A Man who takes Reason for his guide	0	6	Samuel Hadfield	0	3
A Friend to Republicanism	0	6	James Hadfield, jun.	0	3
An Advocate of the principles Richard Carlile advocates, long before he (Carlile) was born	1	0	Thomas Hartley	0	3
A Friend to Freedom	1	0	John Buckley	0	2
A Friend	0	6	J. Hibbert	0	6
Jonas Robinson	1	3	Jonathan Tetlow	1	6
James Stansfield	1	6	Samuel Bruckshaw	0	3
Joshua Cheetham	0	6	William Markland	0	6
John Fielding	0	6	James Collier	0	3
A Friend to Reform	0	6	Samuel Clayton	1	0
An Enemy to Priestcraft	0	6	Richard Thorp	1	0
A. P. a seceder from all my- thology	1	0	Martha Matley	0	6
Samuel Sidebottom	0	6	Ann Clayton	0	6
A Friend to Civil and Reli- gious Liberty	1	0	James Bardsley	0	3
John Kenworthy	0	6	Abel Tomlinson	0	6
J. Binns	1	0	Eliza Tomlinson	0	6
William Boardman	0	6	Thomas Broadbent	1	0
An Enemy to all black coats	1	0	William Ousey	0	6
James Buckley	0	6	William Greenhall	0	6
Abraham Winterbottom	0	6	H. D. an Enemy to Persecu- tion	0	6
Jeremiah Marsland	1	3	W. Cammel, an Enemy to the Black Slugs that devour the tenth of every man's labour	0	6
A Radical	0	6	An Enemy to Persecution	1	6
Solomon Norton	1	0	Mary Southall	0	2
			Thomas Acton	1	0
			W. Hayes	0	6
			By Elizabeth Higson, from a Lover of Honesty, J. S.	5	0
			Ann Clayton	0	6
			Elizabeth Higson	2	0
			E. G.	1	0

TO MR. CHARLES WALKER, ASHTON-UNDER-LINE.

CITIZEN,
Dorchester Gaol, Jan. 1, 1823.
I CONGRATULATE you on the third anniversary of the day
which heard the cry of the Spaniard for liberty, and which
has been aptly termed by Lord Byron "Freedom's Second
Dawn." We may also safely call it the defeat of the Holy Al-

liance by a word, without firing a gun, as that detested gang of contemptible tyrants are evidently afraid to aim the same blow at Spain that they have aimed at Naples and Piedmont. I fancy that I perceive the commencement of a year that will be pregnant with and productive of advantages to human liberty.

I see that the tone of our tyrants both at home and abroad is altered and humbled. At any rate they will no longer insult us, if they do not yield their power immediately: so I congratulate you and all the Republicans of Albion on the commencement of such a year. The anecdote you relate of the Methodist Parson and the poor worn-out labourer is characteristic of Christianity in all places and at all times, but more particularly of that more hypocritical sect called Methodists. If mankind would but calculate the expence of their religion they would cease to bawl for any other release from burdens until they had freed themselves of that which is the worst and most useless. For a Christian to call himself a Reformer is the greatest piece of duplicity and self-delusion that has yet come under the cognizance of my ideas. I do not set them all down as hypocrites, professing what they do not understand, I believe the majority of them are ignorant of what they adhere to for want of that discussion to which we challenge them; but there are certainly many of them the most profound hypocrites that ever infested the dwellings of mankind. We all cry out that taxation is the cause of all our distresses, but few will point the attention of the people to that grievous taxation which their Religion, their Christianity imposes upon them. Expences for legislation and government there must be, but expences for religious purposes are altogether unnecessary and unproductive of good, but certainly productive of evil, yet setting aside the interest of the debt, the church and the priests of this country impose a greater taxation upon the people than the State itself. Let those who call themselves Christian Reformers look to this circumstance, and defend the burthens which their religion imposes before they seek to lessen any other species of taxation.

I have heard of your prosecution with three other friends, for exhibiting a flag on the 16th of August, in commemoration of that blood-stained day; but, from the refusal of the inhabitants of Ashton to support the expences, I hope it will fall to the ground. The power of your corrupt Justices is nearly at an end. Fletcher, Hulton, Hay, and Ethelston may contrive to complete this prosecution against you, but

you will have the satisfaction to see them fly or be prosecuted in their turn. Their murderous deeds are too deep to be forgiven, too impressive to be forgotten. If all the other scoundrels in the country escape with impunity, these must be gibbeted for an example, a remembrance and a retribution. I comply with the request of a friend, and once more enrol their deeds in verse at the end of this letter, as appropriate to your situation. If it be your doom to suffer imprisonment with your three friends, I can only wish you may be so situated as to preserve your healths, which is the main consideration in passing through a period of confinement in a Gaol. Courage and constancy I know you will exhibit: it has been common with almost every persecuted Reformer of late, and I attribute much of the 'vantage ground we have gained to their noble conduct under persecution.

I thank you and friends of Ashton-under-line and its vicinity, for your very valuable support, and assure you that I shall study to give weight and influence to the principles we advocate, whatever corporeal restraints I may continue to receive. I am so habituated to a Gaol that I feel nothing of confinement, further than as it may be calculated to undermine my health. I entered this Gaol with perfect indifference of mind as to the situation I was in, and I shall leave it, if I do leave it alive, under the same disposition.

Respectfully yours,

R. CARLILE.

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

SIR,

Sleaford, Lincolnshire, Dec. 27, 1822.

THE following parody on Lord Byron's "Ode to the French," was sent by the author for insertion in "Drakard's Stamford News," and appeared therein on Friday, the 24th of December, 1819, since which time I have not seen or heard that it has been copied in any other journal or periodical of any kind; should you, therefore, think it deserving a better fate than the perishable columns of a newspaper, you will oblige me by stretching out a protecting hand to rescue it from oblivion by giving it an early place in your "Republican." Notwithstanding the time is long past since those desolating scenes which gave rise to the parody in question, it is no small gratification to a Son of Freedom to hand down to posterity the bloody deeds of the fatal, but never-to-be-forgotten 16th of August, 1819. *Facit indignatio versum.*

That you, Sir, and your family, may speedily be liberated from the horrors of a Gaol, and escape the merciless fangs of your cold-blooded Despots, who are endeavouring to overwhelm you with ruin, is the sincere wish of

A REPUBLICAN AND MATERIALIST.

ODE.

A Parody on Lord Byron's "Ode to the French."

"Libertas et anima nostra in dubio est."

"Some devil had thrust sweet Nature's hand aside
Ere she had pour'd her balm within their breasts,
To warm their gross and earthy mould of flesh
With pity."

OH, shame to ye, dastardly corps!
Oh, shame to your horrible deeds!
Oh, Manchester! still are thy streets stained with gore!
How humanity shudders and bleeds!
An abhorrence shall mark ye forlorn,
Your infamy never shall die;
The curse of your country:—and ages unborn
Shall recount the sad tale with a sigh,—
Of the Manchester Yeomanry, foremost in guilt,
By the lives they have ta'en, and the blood they have spilt.
What's become of thy spirit of yore,
Oh Albion! once isle of the free,
When Hampden, and Sydney, and Russel, all swore
To cleave unto Liberty's tree!
Dread screams have awaken'd their sleep,
From those victims who now are at rest;
And appall'd at the deeds, they piteously weep,
At the blood which has tarnish'd thy crest;
The fam'd Magna Charta they left thee in trust,
By a yeomanry horde is all trampled in dust.
Go search the whole kingdom throughout,
From the northernmost point to Land's-end,
No yeoman has ruffianly dar'd thus to rout,
With carnage, his neighbour and friend.
No:—ye are alone in your shame,
Ye demons, insatiate for blood;
Apollyon's self would ne'er couple his name
With such a vile recreant brood;
Infernally savage,—tremendous in crime;—
Live on record your shame to the latest of time.
While blood down your sabres did flow,
Ye still the defenceless pursu'd;
Men, women, and children alike felt the blow,
Peter's-field with their blood was bedew'd.
Malignity sat on each brow
Imperious—and boiling with rage;
And those misanthropes' faces with fury did glow,
Neither sparing of sex nor of age:
And while their poor victims they spurn'd to the earth,
Triumphantly yell'd these curs'd hell-hounds of death.

Reformers ! your toils were forgot
 By those vampires, misnomer'd men,
 When, hard-earn'd, your pittances went to support
 Corruption's devouring den.
 But affairs are beginning to low'r,
 Calamitous voices now scream,
 And the gew-gaws of tyrants shall fade in an hour,
 And the bubble will burst as a dream :
 Then, then shall true Britons their rights have restor'd,
 And our freedom and laws once again be ador'd.
 What cry is that now rends the air ?
 What voices ascend to the skies ?
 'Tis the cry of revenge,—'tis the millions that swear,
 Each his rights will maintain till he dies :
 Persecution shall brighten their zeal,
 Decorum shall hallow their name,
 And the minions in power shall mournfully feel,
 How resistless the spirit and flame
 That Freemen will breathe, when their hearts are on fire,
 For fair Liberty's cause, against foemen so dire.
 Their standards unfurl'd in the field,
 To guard constitutional laws ;
 Such spirit has taught us we never should yield,
 Rather die in so noble a cause.
 Your claims then assert without fear,
 Rally round in despite of your foes ;
 The manes appease of your countrymen dear,
 Who fell by th' assassins' keen blows ;
 And the motto of millions,—the watch-word that saves,
 Be for ever revered—" Britons ne'er will be slaves."
 No blood-thirty Caliban crew
 Could e'er have devised such a plan ;
 No devil incarnate his hands would imbrue,
 As this murderous yeomanry clan.
 Oh, curs'd be the hours of your birth,
 Ye cold-blooded wretches, who'd sever
 Smiling infants from mothers :—all nations on earth
 Shall hate ye for ever and ever ;—
 And on history's page, in the long after years,
 Shall your names be abhorr'd as they 'waken fresh tears.
 Oh, shame to ye, dastardly corps !
 Oh, shame to your horrible deeds !
 Oh, Manchester ! still are thy streets stain'd with gore !
 How humanity shudders and bleeds !
 An abhorrence shall mark ye forlorn,
 Your infamy never shall die ;
 The curse of your country ;—and ages unborn
 Shall recount the sad tale with a sigh,—
 Of the sixteenth of August, which " stands, aye, accurs'd
 In the calender," noted for crimes of the worst.

HUMANITAS.

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

DEAR SIR,

Hull, December 27, 1822.

THE most eminent political philosophers seem to agree in opinion, that religion of some sort or other, is essential to the well-being, if not to the very existence of society. Montesquieu supposes that the different religions are adapted to the different climes and dispositions of the people; that Mahometanism is calculated to promote the happiness of the Africans and the Turks, and that Christianity suits best, the temper and clime of Europeans.

Had they insisted on the absolute necessity of morality, instead of religion, they perhaps would have been nearer the truth; you have been contending that the former alone is necessary, and that the latter so far from being necessary, is really prejudicial to society.

Now, although every attention is due to the arguments that may be brought forward *pro* and *con* on this interesting and important subject, no impartial man will deny, that facts and experience are superior to abstract reasoning, and better calculated to lead us to a correct decision on the matter. By this superior test then, let us, if you please, now try the utility of the religion of Islamism on the authority of "Golberey's Travels in Africa."

Speaking of the Moors of Zaara he says "they are very zealous Mahometans; but as superstition is ever the attendant of a foul conscience, and systematic depravity, they are in consequence, most ridiculously superstitious. Their priests whom they call Marabouhts, and who form a very important tribe among them, support this deplorable weakness."

This is surely a sufficient proof that these Moors are a very religious, priest-loving people: and we will therefore now attend to the great practical blessings, which society derives from this state of things. "These men," says he, "are very vicious, corrupt, inhuman, cruel, and ferocious". In another place, he says, "They are crafty and perfidious" — "equally cowardly and cruel, who possess no social principle, who know no right, either natural or political, and who follow no other impulse, than what their self-interest, and their passions dictate; their manners are barbarous, corrupted, and disgusting". Here is a picture of a very religious people, under the guidance of priests!

Leaving these poor deluded wretches, we will pass on to another and very different nation in Africa, who have no priests, nor religious worship whatever. Oh, in what a shocking and horrid state must these wretches be; will our Religionists exclaim: What a pity the English Missionaries are not amongst them!

Well take courage, friends, and view with me, if you dare, their *deplorable* state.

"One of the principles of their morality is, to do unto others as they would be done by, they never plunder, or rob among themselves, they never make slaves:" [Christian Englishmen, will not this make you blush?] "nor has it ever been known, that a Bamboukain has

become the captive of his countrymen, and been sold by him. They mutually assist each other, and keep their promise inviolable; they practice hospitality with the utmost pleasure and alacrity, and indeed they possess this virtue in an eminent degree; it is particularly towards the blacks, with a preference for Mahometan Negroes, that they exercise it with zeal; they do not like the whites," [It would be strange if they did] "but fear and distrust them; and hence their conduct towards them is very different from that which they shew towards the negroes."

"In the whole country of Bambouk, a black will never be found to want necessaries; if he arrives naked and destitute among those hospitable people, they in an instant procure him clothing. A strange negro enters the first house he meets with in his road, and salutes the master, if it be at the hour of repast, he is placed at his side, and eats in the same bowl, every one treats him with cordiality; and when the meal is finished, the stranger rises, and addresses the host with a sentence to the following effect; I thank thee brother, may Mahomet bless thee, and may God prosper thee. With these words a strange black may travel through the whole of Bambouk, without wanting any thing, and meeting every where with a favourable reception."

Such is the character of a people, who have not been *blessed* with a priesthood for more than three hundred years! "A very singular circumstance, which distinguishes the Mandings of Bambouk, from their original stamina, is, that they have no marabouhts or priests, and they will not suffer them to exist in their country."

"They however had these priests at the time of conquering the country, but they conspired against the chiefs of the nation; they wished to possess themselves of the sovereign authority, to subjugate the Bamboukains, and to render themselves masters of the gold mines."

"This conspiracy was discovered, and all the Marabouhts were put to death; from this period, these priests were not only expelled from Bambouk, but they would not suffer a Mahometan Priest to enter the territory." Some profound religionist will no doubt fancy, that the foregoing is fabricated by some Deist or Atheist: softly!—softly!—for the author adds very orthodoxly, "The country, perhaps, became more tranquil from this circumstance, but the progress of knowledge certainly suffered from it, and from this event, which is now, more than three hundred years ago, the Bamboukains have become the only branch of the Mandings, which betray such gross ignorance, such absurd and ridiculous superstitions, such indifference for religion, and such apathy and stupidity. The Bamboukains suppose that the devil fabricates gold at an immense depth, in subterraneous caverns; that he causes this rich metal to be worked by slaves; and that the falling in of the pits, is only a trick of the devils, who wants to get some new slaves to replace those he has lost; impressed with these notions, they are afraid they would displease the devil if they were to try to save them, and thus deprive him of his slaves, besides running the risk, that his highness would carry the gold out of the country, and establish his work-shop in some other place.

“ They in general imagine, that the devil keeps a very good table, and gives his slaves plenty of food, and that when they can obtain some confidential place from him, they live in high style, and their situation is in every respect enviable.

Foolish and superstitious as this breed certainly is, that of our religionists is equally so, and much more gloomy and horrible; for they imagine the devil keeps a very bad table, affording only one solitary dish of “ fire and brimstone ” for his wretched slaves.

That your efforts to eradicate superstition from the minds of the people, may prove successful is the sincere wish of

Your friend and servant,

J. JACKSON.

	£.	s.	d.		£.	s.	d.
Several small sums collected by Mrs. Hooper.	0	5	0	Castlereagh's Ghost, 2nd. subscription.	0	2	6
A Female Friend.	0	1	0	W. Hird.	0	0	6
R. Carrall.	0	3	0	J. D. Dawson. (Beverly)	1	1	0
W. Taylor.	0	1	0	W. Hodgson.	0	10	6
R. Osborn.	0	1	0	A Female Christian, who thinks it much better to pity and pray for those who are in error, than to plunder and imprison them	0	3	6
Philo-Cosmopolite.	0	2	6				
“ My mouth shall speak truth, and wickedness is an abomination to my lips.”	0	0	6				

TO MR. J. JACKSON, HULL, YORKSHIRE.

DEAR SIR,

Dorchester Gaol, Jan. 4th 1823.

I CANNOT consent to your conclusion, that “ *the most eminent political philosophers seem to agree in opinion that religion of some sort or other is essential to the well being, if not to the very existence of society.* ” It is almost a question with me whether any political philosophers have yet openly appeared. Save and except Thomas Paine, I know of none deserving that title for their political writings. Some politicians have written well on one point and some on another, but where is the man, excepting Thomas Paine, who, in a time of danger with regard to existing powers, has openly divulged any system of general politics worthy of coming under the denomination of political philosophy? The writings of Locke, of Montesquieu, of Machiavel, will, in the course of another half century, come under the denomination of political rubbish rather than of political philosophy. An anonymous friend has sent me a beautiful Essay on Revolution, as relating to government, which I put forth as a specimen of perfect political philosophy. I have some eminent private friends of the same stamp as this

author, with the exception that they never use the words God or Nature) who in their private circles exhibit themselves as the most accomplished political philosophers; but they shrink from a public promulgation, with the support of their names, of what they think necessary to be done. If we can only establish the right of free discussion upon legislative sanction, and see persecutions for all matters of opinion legally condemned, this country would instantly exhibit a mass of talent that would speedily irradiate the whole globe. The fear of direful persecution keeps it concealed, and much of it will be destroyed as well as smothered. Talent increases in strength and in quantity as it finds room for expansion. An inventive mind that dares not promulge its inventions is the most painful state that can be endured; because pain is felt only in proportion to the degree of sensibility in the organ; and pain of mind with the philanthropist exists in a ratio with the good he wills but is prevented from accomplishing.

But to the point of religion: I cannot but think the "political philosophers" to whom you allude have mistaken the thing for morality. Morality is every thing towards the happiness or the existence of a society—religion is nothing. Priests and priestly politicians have so confounded their bugbear religion with the word morality, that it will be a work of time to separate, to distinguish, and to explain the meaning of the two words in a proper manner, so as to have them rightly and generally understood. I see it is a point of great importance that they should be distinguished and separately understood, for it has been the universal cry against the advocates of Liberty, that being avowedly hostile to religion and the undue power it gives the Priesthood, they either designedly or undesignedly seek to break up the very foundation of social order. Now, I see clearly that social order has not the slightest foundation on religion, but altogether on morality; and as the former is always attended with a great expence, and the latter the very essence of economy, it follows, that a greater degree of social order can be established in the absence of all religion than in its presence. Religion generates taxation, and taxation is a breach of social order in every degree it takes, for it lessens the benefits of industry: thus religion is clearly opposed to morality, which embraces both industry and social order. Morality not only produces no expence, but it expresses a saving of all that is unnecessary, or every thing that may be considered waste, which must, by increasing the strength of a community, increase social order. I know, in fact, no

two principles recognized in human actions more distinct and opposite than morality and religion. They are other words to express *good and evil*. Under this conviction I labour assiduously to explain them; to preserve the principles which relate to the one, and to destroy those which relate to the other.

An example of the distinction between morality and religion is at all times good, even if it be fetched from Africa; but those distinctions which are every day and everywhere recognized at home, are more apt to impress when used as examples. Besides, it is universally allowed by impartial observers, that Christianity retains less of morality than does Islamism. The most sanctified Christian will rob and cheat you in the way of trade if he can, and if you do not look well after him: whereas, travellers acknowledge that a child with the Mahometans will be as justly dealt with as a grown person. Christian Priests, Monks, and Jesuits, have been some of the most profligate men that ever existed on the face of the earth. There is no vice, no unnatural crime, no political crime but has been quite common among them, and so long as they exist, morality and reformation of every kind will be impeded in its progress. Take the Parson Justices all over the country, and I will pledge my life that they are proved more cruel and tyrannical in their magisterial measures than the military or naval officers, or the members of the Aristocracy who are in the commission of Magistrates. I shall never forget the character of the fixed and insolent countenance of Dr. England, the Archdeacon of Dorset, when I first saw him in this Gaol, and asked him, with the other Magistrates, to make some relaxation of my close confinement; "*Naugk*, we cannot alter it," was his answer, without a reason or word of explanation. Their conduct was the same to Mr. Wedderburn; they studiously inflicted all the mental anguish possible upon him at his first coming to the Gaol, and before he had the means to ascertain who and what they were, and what was best to be done to obtain the smallest quantity of punishment. These are all instances of the opposition of religion to morality, and the almost inevitable necessity, that to practise the one the other must be forsaken.

To yourself, and all my Hull friends, I return my thanks, and hope they will increase their morality so far as to speak out manfully on this most interesting subject, and dismiss all further religious or political Protestantism.—Yours, &c.

R. CARLILE.

Printed and Published by R. Carlile, 5, Water Lane, Fleet Street, and 201, Strand.—All Correspondences for "The Republican" to be left at the places of publication.